

# ATLANTIS

This is ATLANTIS, a journal of postal Diplomacy, edited and published by Deborah and Christopher Schlsicher, 5122 W. Carmen Ave., Chicago, Illinois 60630.

Subscriptions to ATLANTIS are \$1.50 for 10 issues. There are no games open at present, but substitutes and stand-by players are needed.

"Fall 1910"

1970C

R-1

## RUSSIA BEGINS TO FALL!!

RUSSIA (Perry):

A Liv-War [Dislodged & Annihilated]  
A Mos holds  
A War-Gal  
A Sil-War  
A Boh (S) A Tri-Tyr  
A Tri-Tyr  
A Tyr-Pie  
A Ven (S) A Tyr-Pis  
A Alb holds  
F Ion-Nap [Dislodged]  
A Apu (S) F Ion-Nap  
F Aeg-Ion  
F Bul (sc)-Gre

FRANCE (Comber):

A Ber (S) ENGLISH A Pru  
A Bur (S) A Mun  
A Pie-Tyr  
A Mun (S) A Pie-Tyr  
A Ruh-Hol  
A Rom holds  
F Tus (S) A Rom  
A Mar-Pie  
F Lyo (S) A Mar-Pie  
F Nap-Ion  
F Tun (S) F Nap-Ion

ENGLAND (Miller):

F Tyr (S) FRENCH F Nap-Ion  
F Nth holds  
F Bal (S) A Pru  
A Kie (S) FRENCH A Mun  
A Fin-StP  
F Bar (S) A Fin-StP

"Fall 1910"  
[continued]  
ENGLAND (Miller):

1970C

R-1

A StP-Liv  
F Bot (S) A StP-Liv  
A Pru (S) A StP-Liv

Underlined moves do not succeed. The retreat of the Russian F Ion is due along with the "Winter 1910" builds and removals.

"Winter 1910"

1970C

R-1

RUSSIA (Peery): Mos, War, Sev, Vie, Ank, Bul, Bud, Rum, Smy, Con, Ven, Tri, Ser, Gre. (14) Build 2.  
FRANCE (Comber): Par, Mar, Bre, Del, Spa, Por, Tun, Mun, Ber, Rom, Nap, Hol. (12) Build 1.  
ENGLAND (Miller): Liv, Lon, Edi, Nwy, Swe, Den, StP, ~~Ndx~~, Kie. (8) Remove 1.

Gain -- ~~Ydpp~~. Builds and removals are due 17 March 1972.

"Spring 1909"

1970AJ

R-2

GERMANY (CD):

A Ber [unordered, holds]

ENGLAND (Lakofka):

F Lon-Eng  
A Edi-Nwy  
F Nth (C) A Edi-Nwy  
F Bar (S) A Edi-Nwy  
F Swe (S) A Edi-Nwy  
A Bel-Ruh  
F Mid-Spa (sc)  
F Bre-Mid  
A Par-Bur  
F Por (S) F Mid-Spa (sc)  
A Kie (S) A Mun  
A Mun (S) TURKISH A Gal-Boh [NSO] [dislodged  
[and annihilated]  
F Bal-Pru  
F Spa (sc)-Mar  
A Gas (S) F Spa (sc)-Mar

TURKEY (Jordan):

A Fin-Nwy  
A StP (S) A Fin-Nwy  
A Mos-Liv  
A Gal-Sil  
A Sev-Mos  
A Apu-Rom  
F Tus-Lyo  
F Wes-Mid  
F Tun-NAf  
F Bla-Con  
F Con-Aeg

[continued on page 6]

## DIPLOMACY DATA -- PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS

Rod Walker

Time was when postal Diplomacy was a lovesome, simple thing. The number of 'zines could be counted on the fingers, the number of GMs ditto, the number of gamees was small, and the entire roster of all postal players, with their addresses, took up only a page or so in GRAUSTARK.

Those days are dead forever. Today (through game 1972H) we have: over 250 regular games in progress, over 80 regular and variant 'zines, over 50 Gamesmasters, and some 1750 game positions played by over 400 players. Postal 'zines are published in the U.S., Canada, England, Belgium and South Africa. In all, nearly 350 different Diplomacy 'zines have appeared at one time or another (based on a count of titles used).

What happened? Well, of course, every hobby starts out small and grows as more people hear of it. And in 1970 I authored, and got GRI to insert in Diplomacy sets, a list of contacts for postal play. There was an immediate and obvious effect: a deluge of inquiries to John Boardman, Don Miller, John McCallum, myself, and others, and a new galloping rise in games. The story of Diplomacy's growth can be seen in the following table of the number of regular games begun each year:

1963. . . . .	3
1964. . . . .	5
1965. . . . .	23
1966. . . . .	67
1967. . . . .	56
1968. . . . .	102
1969. . . . .	96
1970. . . . .	73
1971. . . . .	141

There are some inevitable distortions in these figures (some variants, such as "team" games were counted as late as 1967, and huge 20-game tournaments appeared in 1968 and 1969), but they indicate the trend clearly enough. To accentuate this, although I have not seen the final figures, it would appear that the number of variant games which began in 1971 was quadruple the number begun in 1970.

The problem I wish to bring up here is the problem of keeping track of all this. Statistics of the game are important to any real understanding of it. They are the stuff the rating systems work on, and upon which any notions of which country is "etrong" and which is "weak" must ultimately depend. I think such notions are wrong-headed, but there is no denying there is some basis for them in the data. (A survey of about a dozen games ended in a given time-span, conducted in my NUMENOR, suggests that "strong" countries may have benefitted from a long succession of "strong" players.) In any event, all real analysee of the game will have to appeal to the data, and somebody has to collect that data.

John Boardman started to do so. He created the Boardman Numbers for standard nomenclature, invented the supply-center chart for game recording, and began to publish data in GRAUSTARK. Title to the Boardman Numbers was transferred by John to Charles Wells in 1967, by Charles to John Koning in 1968, and by John to me in 1969. I have been the custodian of the Numbers for nearly 3 years now, and I would like to express some thoughts about what the job is like and what future may be in store for it.

NUMENOR (10/\$1.50 from me, by the way) carries the initial Boardman Number assignments (listing number, 'zine, GM, and players), changes to those listings

(players dropped, resigned, replaced, eliminated)(new GM or 'zine), and final results (full player roster, supply-center chart, &c.). It also publishes bibliographic listings on all 'zines, a rating list, and occasional letters or articles. How do we get from raw data to these kinds of listings?

When a new game appears, it receives a Boardman Number (the year it began plus an alphabetical designator assigned in the order I find out about the game; 1971A was the first game last year, 1971EK the last; the sequence is: A through Z, AB through AZ, BA through BZ, and so on). Variant games are assigned Miller Numbers by Lew Pulsipher, and a few games (5-man "Napoleonic" games, e.g.) receive both. Every postal game is thus numbered (this rule applies regardless of my personal feelings about the game, its rateability, and so on). Games which may not be rated in one or more rating systems receive a prefix of # (current raters are: John McCallum, Burton Labelle, Jeff Power, Walt Buchanan, Brenton Ver Ploeg and myself).

From then on, a complex statistical machine swings into gear. Each game has a file sheet in a loose-leaf binder. This sheet indicates 'zine(s), GM(e), players and player changes, and a supply-center chart. A 3x5 card file is maintained on every player, plus an extra redundant 3x5 file on all players listed in the NUMENOR Rating List. A 3x5 file is maintained on every 'zine published, listing title, publisher, and so on, and listing every number published. A 3x5 file is maintained on player changes.

OK, now a 'zine comes in. The number is recorded on the 'zine file. Then we work on the games. In a Fall season, the supply centers held are recorded on the chart in my binder; in a Winter season, unbuilt units are noted on the chart. When a player drops, resigns, or is eliminated, this is noted on the game sheet, then on the main player file, and then a full entry is made (if the player is in there) in the rating file (one entry on the player's card and a notation on a player summary card which tells me what adjustment to make in the last printed version of the Rating List). I may note GM errors in all this, and I usually try to inform him of these as a courtesy; usually these are only errors in counting centers. So far so good. If a game ends, I record the achievement of the survivors on the sheet, the main file, the rating file, the player summary card, and so on. (And while the game is in progress, similar entries are made for replacement players, of course.) The game sheet is then removed from its binder and placed in a "hold" binder, to be printed up in the next NUMENOR. When that is done, the game is placed with other completed games in a third binder.

All this recording and filing takes time. For well-run games (such as those in ATLANTIS, GRAUSTARK, DIPLOPHOBIA, COSTAGUANA, and others), this may only be a few moments. On more poorly-run games, I may spend 10-15 minutes trying to figure out what's going on. Let us say I average 5 minutes a game. For 250 games, that's about 20 hours a month.

And that is the main problem. The cost of maintaining trade agreements necessary to keeping records is rising precipitously. The time involved in keeping records is climbing rapidly. The time required to publish the data is also going up. If the expansion of postal Diplomacy keeps up the pace it has shown recently, data collection may become a full-time job before we know it.

We will need, sooner or later, a solution to this growing problem. It could be arranged to pay someone to do the work, but that is an unattractive and probably impractical solution. I believe it is certainly desirable and probably practical to continue to depend on volunteer labor for data collection. The obvious answer is a division of labor. This calls to mind, perhaps, one of the Diplomacy organizations which are springing up all over the landscape these days. Unfortunately, Diplomacy organizations have displayed two serious defects: first, a tendency to

seize any weapon at hand as a means of enforcing decisions and defending prerogative; and second, to fight other organizations. On the other hand, the Boardman Numbers had been around since 1963, under four Custodians, and have never been used as a weapon or in a partisan fashion. Even at the height of his feud with Charles Reinsel, John Boardman continued to assign Boardman Numbers to Reinsel's games (even though he didn't use them). And at the height of my feud with Buddy Tretick, I continued to assign Numbers to his games (even though he does not use them) and to record their progress. On the basis of experience, therefore, I am inclined to be adamant about keeping the data collection apparatus out of the clutches of all organizations, whether I otherwise approve of them or not. That doesn't mean, of course, that organizations couldn't collect and publish their own data, but there is no sense in a duplication of effort (especially under the circumstances I have previously discussed), and having a single source of data is more convenient and less confusing.

A division of labor, therefore, means a collection of private individuals, coordinating their efforts, accomplishing the various tasks now done by one individual. There is already some tendency in this direction. When we get to the point where there are a great many English games, Hartley Patterson of WAR BULLETIN has agreed to collect data on them and transmit it over here. We hope eventually to have the same agreement on the Continent. One possibility suggests itself for North America. We have one person assigning Boardman Numbers (this requires a single file because it depends on strict alpha sequence). We then could have, say, three data collectors: one for Canadian 'zines, one for 'zines published east of the Mississippi, and one for 'zines published west of it. These three could then feed all data to a single publisher or could publish separately, using a standard format. It's an idea, anyway.

There is already one division of labor which is taking place. Tony Pandin's TERMINUS is publishing all the old game records, of games completed to date, and we should be through with it by the end of this year (I'm feeding Tony the data, and John McCallum is helping to correct material on the early games, and Tony is printing it via computer). At that point, the publication of games currently ending will be transferred from NUMENOR to TERMINUS, and NUMENOR thereafter will not print completed game charts, but only the initial listings and changes.

The problems I have outlined are obviously, therefore, not insurmountable. A solution is already partly under way. However, I personally am interested in any additional ideas anyone might have about how to handle the situation from here on, and especially if it gets out of hand in the way I have suggested it might. The collection of data on games may seem tedious, and it may not have the glamor of creating organizations, and group in-fighting, and feuds, but it is the nuts and bolts of postal Diplomacy. We don't really need organizations, but we need game records, and any help I get in keeping up my end of that job will be gratefully appreciated.

#####

Larry Blandin and Len Lakofka are going to be insufferable from now on, after getting their pictures in the Chicago Daily News, yesterday (2 March 1972) in an article on War!. They did a good job of getting publicity for the IFW and the hobby tho.... They also got in a plug on

#### DIPCON V

To be held in Chicago's Sherman House, July 22 & 23. They expect about 300 people to show up for this, the biggest event in the Diplomacy world yet.

Special rates are available from the Sherman House for the convention -- a double that normally costs \$50 will be only \$18/night [that's for 2 people, so bring a friend....]

R-2

A Pru (S) GERMAN A Der  
F Adr-Ion  
F Nap-Tyr  
A Pie-Mar  
A Sil-Mun  
A Boh (S) A Sil-Mun  
A Tyr (S) A Sil-Mun

XX

R-4

(CCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCCC)

R-5

*(The following information was obtained from the records of the FBI, Department of Justice, Office of the Inspector General, Washington, D.C., dated 10/10/78.)*

R-6

```
#####
```

[illegible]

## THE CONVOYED ARMY . . . REVISITED

Buddy Tretick

I ask you, dear Gamesmaster, how you would rule in the situation which follows, and to defend your ruling by direct quotes from your written house rules.

I am going to write a set of orders which should be considered as a legitimate set of orders.

ENGLAND: A Liv-Bre, F Mid C A Liv-Bre, F Iri C A Liv-Bre, F NAT C A Liv-Bre.

RUSSIA: F Cly-Nat, F Nwg S F Cly-Nat.

Clearly, the English fleet North Atlantic is dislodged. [Agreed.]

I claim that there is a complete convoy path available for the convoy. Since the "player" did NOT specify that the army had to go via fleet North Atlantic the convoy succeeds.

[Hold on there! Take a look at my Houserules, contained in ATLANTIS #42. Under sample ruling "I", note that, "Orders for an army moving by convoy should specify the route, and only those fleet orders for convoy duty which correspond with the orders to the army will be valid."; and, "J", "Orders for an army moving by convoy do not succeed if the convoy is dislodged." This means any part of the convoy, whether one fleet or all. In the case above, I would rule that the convoy was dislodged and therefore could not succeed, because of the dislodgement of one part of the convoy, whether or not there still remained a viable convoy path--the player specified a convoy through North Atlantic, that part was disrupted, therefore the convoy fails. I believe the majority of other GMs would also rule this way.]

Simply choosing a ruling is not good enough. If, however, your (well written, I assume) houserules specify that:

"When more than one fleet is ordered to convoy an army from one coastal province to another, then each and every fleet so ordered to convoy that army, shall be considered to be in the convoy chain. Should any fleet in that convoy chain become dislodged, then the convoy chain is deemed broken, and the convoy fails."

One could add the provision:

"If a convoying fleet is dislodged, or if either convoying fleet in a convoy chain is dislodged, then the convoyed army has NO EFFECT WHATSOEVER on the province that it was ordered to attack."

[My Houserules already are specific on this point. They already incorporate the main direction of your comments, in addition to requiring the orders to be specific in detailing the route the convoy is supposed to take, in the event of any conflict in orders, or possible misinterpretation of those orders.]

Referring to ATLANTIS #48 of 4 February 1972. Your question concerning a ruling on:

FRANCE: F Mid C A Bre-NAf, A Bre-NAf, F Wes C A Bre-NAf, F Tun S A Bre-NAf.

ITALY: F Spa (sc)-Mid, F Naf S F Spa (sc)-Mid.

LA GUERRE rules that North Africa was attacked, by Army Brest, via the Western Mediterranean coast, using fleet Western Mediterranean as a vehicle.

Currently, however, considering simultaneous moves, LA GUERRE rules that since, at the end of the move season, one (or more) of the convoying fleets is dislodged, then the convoy itself fails. Since the convoy fails, then there was no such attack on North Africa in the first place. Hence, support given by fleet

North Africa against convoying fleet Mid Atlantic is not cut, and the convoy fails.  
What a paradox!

Seems to me that GRAUSTARK allows the attacking army to cut a support of fleet North Africa ... even though a convoying fleet is dislodged. In this example, I believe John Boardman [GRAUSTARK] would rule that fleet North Africa is dislodged and that fleet Mid Atlantic is not dislodged.

Care to comment on that John?

[Rod Walker has just sent me word that Allan Calhamer has replied to the problem posed here. The reply should be in the up-coming issue of EREHWON. I will say some more after that article appears.]

From:  
Mr. & Mrs. Christopher Schleicher  
5122 W. Carmen Ave.  
Chicago, Illinois 60630

First Class Mail



Larry Peery  
816 24th St.  
San Diego, California 92102